arXiv:1408.5513v1 [math.CO] 23 Aug 2014

RESOLVABILITY IN HYPERGRAPHS

IMRAN JAVAID*[1], AZEEM HAIDER[2], MUHAMMAD SALMAN[1], SADAF MEHTAB[1]

Abstract. An ordered set W of vertices of a connected graph G is called a resolving set for G if for every two distinct vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, there is a vertex $w \in W$ such that $d(u,w) \neq d(v,w)$. A resolving set of minimum cardinality is called a basis for G and the number of vertices in a basis is called the metric dimension of G, denoted by $dim(G)$. For a vertex u of G and a subset S of $V(G)$, the distance between u and S is the number $\min_{s \in S} d(u,s)$. An ordered t-partition $\Pi = \{S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_t\}$ of $V(G)$ is called a resolving partition if for every two distinct vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, there is a set S_i in Π such that $d(u,S_i) \neq d(v,S_i)$. The minimum t for which there is a resolving t-partition of $V(G)$ is called the partition dimension of G, denoted by $pd(G)$.

A hypergraph is a generalization of a graph where edges can connect any number of vertices. In this paper, we extend the study of metric and partition dimension to hypergraphs. We give sharp lower bounds for the metric and partition dimension of hypergraphs in general and give exact values with specified conditions.

1. Introduction

A *hypergraph* H is a pair $(V(H), E(H))$, where $V(H)$ is a finite set of vertices and $E(H)$ is a finite family of non-empty subsets of $V(H)$, called hyperedges, with $\bigcup_{E \in E(H)} E = V(H)$. $|V(H)|$ and $|E(H)|$ are called the order and the size of H, denoted by m and k, respectively. A *subhypergraph* K of a hypergraph H is a hypergraph with vertex set $V(K) \subseteq V(H)$ and edge set $E(K) \subseteq E(H)$. The *rank* of H, denoted by $rank(H)$, is the maximum cardinality of a hyperedge in $E(H)$. H is *linear* if for distinct hyperedges $E_i, E_j \in E(H)$, $|E_i \cap E_j| \leq 1$, so for a linear hypergraph there may be no repeated hyperedges of cardinality greater than one. A hypergraph H with no hyperedge is a subset of any other is called *Sperner*.

A vertex $v \in V(H)$ is *incident* with a hyperedge E of H if $v \in E$. If v is incident with exactly n hyperedges, then we say that the *degree* of v is n; if all the vertices $v \in V(H)$ have degree n, then H is *n-regular*. Similarly, if there are exactly n vertices incident with a hyperedge E, then we say that the size of E is n; if all the hyperedges $E \in E(H)$ have size n, then H is *n-uniform*. A graph is simply a 2-uniform hypergraph. A hyperedge E of H is called a *pendant hyperedge* if for

Key words and phrases. metric dimension, partition dimension, hypergraph

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C12, 05C65

∗ Corresponding author: ijavaidbzu@gmail.com.

$E_i, E_j \in E(H)$, $E \cap E_i \neq \emptyset$ and $E \cap E_j \neq \emptyset$ implies $(E \cap E_i) \cap (E \cap E_j) \neq \emptyset$. A *path* from a vertex v to another vertex u, in a hypergraph, is a finite sequence of the form $v, E_1, w_1, E_2, w_2, ..., E_{l-1}, w_{l-1}, E_l, u$, having *length* l such that $v \in E_1$, $w_i \in E_i \cap E_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, 2, ...l-1$ and $u \in E_l$. A hypergraph H is called *connected* if there is a path between any two vertices of H. All hypergraphs considered in this paper are connected Sperener hypergraphs.

The primal graph, $prim(H)$, of a hypergraph H is a graph with vertex set $V(H)$ and vertices x and y of $prim(H)$ are adjacent if and only if x and y are contained in a hyperedge. The *middle graph*, $M(H)$, of H is a subgraph of $prim(H)$ formed by deleting all loops and parallel edges. The *dual* of $H = (\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_m\}, \{E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_k\})$, denoted by H^*, is the hypergraph whose vertices are $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_k\}$ corresponding to the hyperedges of H and with hyperedges $V_i = \{e_j \ : \ v_i \in E_j \text{ in } H\}$, where $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. In other words, the dual H^* swaps the vertices and hyperedges of H.

A hypergraph H is said to be a *hyperstar* if $E_i \cap E_j = C \neq \emptyset$, for any $E_i, E_j \in E(H)$. We will call C, the *center* of the hyperstar. If there exist a sequence of hyperedges $E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_k$ in a hypergraph H, then H is said to be (1) a *hyperpath* if $E_i \cap E_j \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $|i - j| = 1$; (2) a *hypercycle* if, $E_i \cap E_j \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $|i - j| = 1 \pmod{k}$. A connected hypergraph H with no hypercycle is called a *hypertree*. A subhypertree of a hypertree H with edge set, say $\{E_{p_1}, E_{p_2}, \ldots, E_{p_l}\} \subset E(H)$, is called a *branch* of H if E_{p_1} (say) is the only hyperedge such that, for $E_i, E_j \in E(H) \setminus \{E_{p_1}, E_{p_2}, \ldots, E_{p_l}\}$, $E_{p_1} \cap E_i \neq \emptyset$ and $E_{p_1} \cap E_j \neq \emptyset$ implies $(E_{p_1} \cap E_i) \cap (E_{p_1} \cap E_j) \neq \emptyset$. The hyperedge E_{p_1} is called the *joint* of the branch.

The *distance* between any two vertices v and u of H, $d(v, u)$, is the length of a shortest path between them and $d(v, u) = 0$ if and only if $v = u$. The *eccentricity* of a vertex v of H, denoted by $ecc(v)$, is the number $\max\limits_{u \in V(H)} d(u, v)$. The *diameter* of H is the number $\max\limits_{v \in V(H)} ecc(v)$, and is denoted by $diam(H)$. Two vertices u and v of H are said to be diametral vertices if $d(u, v) = diam(H)$. The *representation* $r(v|W)$ of a vertex v with respect to an ordered set $W = \{w_1, w_2, ..., w_q\} \subseteq V(H)$ is a q-tuple $r(v|W) = (d(v, w_1), d(v, w_2), ..., d(v, w_q))$. The set W is called a *resolving set* for a hypergraph H if $r(v|W) \neq r(u|W)$ for any two different vertices $v, u \in V(H)$. A resolving set with minimum cardinality is called a *basis* for H and that minimum cardinality is called the *metric dimension* of H, denoted by $dim(H)$.

The metric dimension was first studied by Slater [13] and independently by Harary and Melter [7]. It is a parameter that has appeared in various application, as diverse as combinatorial optimization, pharmaceutical chemistry, robot navigation and sonar. In recent years, a considerable literature has been developed (see [4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12]). The problem of determining whether $dim(H) < M$ $(M > 0)$ is an NP-complete problem [6, 11].

To determine whether a given set $W \subseteq V(H)$ is a resolving set for H, W needs only to be verified for the vertices in $V(H) \setminus W$ since every vertex $w \in W$ is the only vertex of H whose distance from w is 0.

Possibly to gain insight into the metric dimension, Chartrand *et al.* introduced the notion of a resolving partition and partition dimension [2, 3]. To define the partition dimension, the distance $d(v, S)$ between a vertex v in H and $S \subseteq V(H)$ is defined as $\min_{s \in S} d(v, s)$. Let $\Pi = \{S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_t\}$ be an ordered t-partition of $V(H)$ and v be any vertex of H. Then the *representation* $r(v|\Pi)$ of v with respect Π is a t-tuple $r(v|\Pi) = (d(v, S_1), d(v, S_2), ..., d(v, S_t))$. The partition Π is called a *resolving partition* for a hypergraph if $r(v|\Pi) \neq r(u|\Pi)$ for any two distinct vertices $v, u \in V(H)$. The *partition dimension* of a hypergraph H is the cardinality of a minimum resolving partition, denoted by $pd(H)$.

From the definition of a resolving partition, it can be observed that the property of a given partition Π of a hypergraph H to be a resolving partition of H can be verified by investigating the pairs of vertices in the same class. Indeed, $d(x, S_i) = 0$ for every vertex $x \in S_i$ but $d(x, S_j) \neq 0$ with $j \neq i$. It follows that $x \in S_i$ and $y \in S_j$ are resolved either by S_i or S_j for every $i \neq j$.

In this paper, we study the metric and partition dimension of hypergraphs. We give the sharp lower bounds for the metric and partition dimension of graphs. Also, we study the metric dimension of some well-known families of hypergraphs such as hyperpaths, hypertrees and n-uniform linear hypercycles. Further, we study the partition dimension of all the n-uniform linear hypercycles. We also characterize all the n-uniform (for all $n \geq 2$ and $n \neq 3$ when k is even) linear hypergraphs with partition dimension n. Moreover, all the hypergraphs with metric dimension 1 and partition dimension 2 are characterized.

2. Metric Dimension of Hypergraphs

If we denote all the vertices of degree d in $E_{i_1} \cap E_{i_2} \cap ... \cap E_{i_d}$ by the class $C(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d)$, then the collection of all such classes gives a partition of $V(H)$. We denote $n(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d) = |C(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d)| - 1$ when $C(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d) \neq \emptyset$, otherwise take $n(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d) = 0$. Thus, we have the following straightforward proposition:

Proposition 2.1. *For any two distinct vertices $u, v \in C(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d)$, we have $d(u, w) = d(v, w)$ for any $w \in V(H) \setminus \{u, v\}$.*

Thus, we have the following lemma related to the resolving set for H:

Lemma 2.2. *If $u, v \in C(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d)$ and $W \subseteq V(H)$ resolves H, then at least one of u and v is in W. Moreover, if $u \in W$ and $v \notin W$, then $(W \setminus \{u\}) \cup \{v\}$ also resolves H.*

The lower bound for the metric dimension of hypergraphs is given in the following result:

Proposition 2.3. *For any hypergraph H with k hyperedges,*

$$dim(H) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{i_1<..<i_j}^{k} n(i_1, i_2, ..., i_j).$$

Proof. It follows from the fact that if there are $|C(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d)|$ number of vertices of degree d in $E_{i_1} \cap E_{i_2} \cap ... \cap E_{i_d}$, then, by Lemma 2.2, at least $n(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d)$ vertices should belong to any basis W. □

Remark 2.4. *By Proposition 2.3, it is clear that, in order to obtain a basis set of any hypergraph H, we need to work with only one vertex, say $v_{i_1,i_2,...,i_d} \in C(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d)$ from each class $C(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d)$, if $C(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d) \neq \emptyset$, we call such a vertex, representative vertex of $C(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d)$. We denote the set of all representative vertices in a hypergraph H by $R(H)$ and hence we always have $V(H) \setminus R(H) \subseteq W$ for any basis set W.*

Now, we discuss those hypergraphs for which the equality holds in Proposition 2.3.

Theorem 2.5. *For any hypergraph H with k hyperedges, if $n(i) \neq 0$ for all $E_i \in E(H)$, then $dim(H) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{i_1<..<i_j}^{k} n(i_1, i_2, ..., i_j)$. Moreover, there are $\prod_{j=1}^{k} \prod_{i_1<..<i_j}^{k} (n(i_1, i_2, ..., i_j) + 1)$ basis for H.*

Proof. Consider $W = V(H) \setminus R(H)$, we have to show that W is a basis for H. Take any two different vertices $v, v' \in R(H)$, since both vertices are representative of different classes and hence there exists a hyperedge E_j such that $v' \in E_j$ but $v \notin E_j$. Since $n(j) \neq 0$ so there exists a vertex of degree one say, $w_j \in V(H)$ such that $w_j \in E_j \cap W$. Clearly $d(v', w_j) = 1$ and $d(v, w_j) \neq 1$, hence W is a basis for H. Further, by Lemma 2.2, there are $\prod_{j=1}^{k} \prod_{i_1<..<i_j}^{k} (n(i_1, i_2, ..., i_j) + 1)$ such W. □

For all $n \geq 4$, if H is an n-uniform linear hypergraph with k hyperedges, then $n(i, i+1) = 0$ for all i. Thus, we have the following corollary:

Corollary 2.6. *For $n \geq 4$, let H be an n-uniform linear hypergraph with k hyperedges. If $n(i) \neq 0$ for all $E_i \in E(H)$, then $dim(H) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n(i)$.*

We give two examples which show that the condition in Theorem 2.5 cannot be relaxed generally.

Example 2.7. *Let H be a hypergraph with vertex set $V(H) = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$ and edge set $E(H) = \{E_1 = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}, E_2 = \{v_3, v_4\}\}$. Clearly, $n(2) = 0$ so H does not satisfy the condition of Theorem 2.5. Without loss of generality, we can take the set of representative vertices $R(H) = \{v_1, v_3, v_4\}$ and hence $W = \{v_2\}$. But W is not a resolving set for H, since $r(v_1|W) = r(v_3|W)$. In fact, $dim(H) = 2 > 1$.*

Example 2.8. *Let H be a hypergraph with vertex set $V(H) = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6\}$ and edge set $E(H) = \{E_1 = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}, E_2 = \{v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6\}, E_3 = \{v_1, v_2, v_5, v_6\}\}$. Clearly, $n(i) = 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $n(1, 2) = n(2, 3) = n(3, 1) \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we can take the set of representative vertices $R(H) = \{v_1, v_3, v_5\}$ and hence $W = \{v_2, v_4, v_6\}$. But W is not a resolving set for H, since $r(v_1|W) = r(v_3|W) = r(v_5|W)$. In fact, $dim(H) = 5 > 3$.*

However, the condition in Theorem 2.5 can be reduced in some special cases as shown in the following results.

Theorem 2.9. *Let H be a hyperpath with k hyperedges, say $E_1, E_2, \ldots E_k$ in a canonical way. Then $dim(H) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n(i) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} n(i, i+1)$ if both $n(1)$ and $n(k)$ are non-zero.*

Proof. Since $n(1) \neq 0$ so there exists a vertex of degree one, say $w_1 \in E_1 \cap W$, similarly there exists a vertex of degree one, say $w_k \in E_k \cap W$. In order to prove the theorem, we only have to show that the representative vertices are resolved by the set $W = V(H) \setminus R(H)$ which follows from the fact that, for any $1 \leq j \leq k$, we have $(d(v_j, w_1), d(v_j, w_k)) = (j, k - j + 1)$ and for any $1 \leq j < k - 1$, we have $(d(v_{j,j+1}, w_1), d(v_{j,j+1}, w_k)) = (j, k - j)$. □

Theorem 2.10. *Let H be a hypertree with k hyperedges and $E_{p1}, E_{p2}, \ldots, E_{pt}$ are the pendant hyperedges. Then $dim(H) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{i_1 < .. < i_j}^{k} n(i_1, i_2, ..., i_j)$ if $n(ps) \neq 0$ for all $s = 1, 2, \ldots, t$.*

Proof. Consider $W = V(H) \setminus R(H)$, similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2.5, again we have to show that W is a basis for H. Take any two different vertices $v, v' \in R(H)$, then both vertices are representative of two different classes and hence there exists a hyperedge E_j such that $v' \in E_j$ but $v \notin E_j$. Now, consider a hyperpath contained in the hypertree H which starts and ends at the pendant hyperedges and contains both v and E_j. By using the proof of Theorem 2.9, it can be seen that the vertices v and v' has different representations with respect to W, which proves the theorem. □

An n-uniform linear hyperstar ($n \geq 3$) is a special case of the hypertree in which $n(i) \neq 0$ for all $E_i \in E(H)$, so we have the following corollary:

Corollary 2.11. *For $n \geq 3$, let H be an n-uniform linear hyperstar with k (≥ 3) hyperedges. Then $dim(H) = k(n - 2)$.*

Consider an n-uniform linear hypercycle $\mathcal{C}_{k,n}$ with k hyperedges. When $n \geq 4$, then $n(i) \neq 0$ for all $E_i \in E(\mathcal{C}_{k,n})$ so, by Corollary 2.6, $dim(\mathcal{C}_{k,n}) = k(n - 3)$.

For the case $n = 3$, we have $n(i) = 0$ for all $E_i \in E(H)$, hence the lower bound given in Proposition 2.3 is zero and every vertex in $\mathcal{C}_{k,3}$ is the representative vertex. We discuss this case in the following result:

Theorem 2.12. *Let $\mathcal{C}_{k,3}$ be a 3-uniform linear hypercycle with k hyperedges. Then $dim\,(\mathcal{C}_{3,3}) = 2$ and for all $k \geq 4$,*

$$dim\,(\mathcal{C}_{k,3}) = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } k \text{ is even,} \\ 3, & \text{if } k \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. In $\mathcal{C}_{k,3}$, each $v_j \in E_j$ represents a vertex of degree one and $v_{j,j+1} \in E_j \cap E_{j+1}$ with $v_{k,k+1} = v_{k,1}$. Clearly, $dim(\mathcal{C}_{k,3}) > 1$ for any k.

If k is even, then we take $W = \{v_1, v_{\frac{k}{2}}\}$.
For $1 < j < \frac{k}{2}$, we have $r(v_j|W) = (j, \frac{k}{2} - j + 1)$ and for $1 \leq j < \frac{k}{2}$, $r(v_{j,j+1}|W) = (j, \frac{k}{2} - j)$. Now, if $\frac{k}{2} + 1 \leq j < k$, then $r(v_j|W) = (k + 2 - j, j - \frac{k}{2} + 1)$ and $r(v_{j,j+1}|W) = (k + 1 - j, j - \frac{k}{2} + 1)$ with $r(v_k|W) = (2, \frac{k}{2} + 1)$, $r(v_{\frac{k}{2},\frac{k}{2}+1}|W) = (\frac{k}{2}, 1)$ and $r(v_{k,1}|W) = (1, \frac{k}{2})$. It is easy to see that the representations of all the vertices with respect to W are distinct, hence W forms a basis for $\mathcal{C}_{k,3}$ and $dim(\mathcal{C}_{k,3}) = 2$.

For the special case when $k = 3$, the set $W = \{v_1, v_2\}$ forms a basis for $\mathcal{C}_{3,3}$. Hence $dim(\mathcal{C}_{3,3}) = 2$.

If $k > 3$ is odd, then we first show that $dim(\mathcal{C}_{k,3}) > 2$. Suppose on contrary that $dim(\mathcal{C}_{k,3}) = 2$ and let W is a basis of $\mathcal{C}_{k,3}$. Let us call the vertex $v_{i,i+1}$ of $\mathcal{C}_{k,3}$, the common vertex. We have the following three possibilities:

(1) W contains both common vertices. Without loss of generality, we suppose that one vertex is $v_{1,2}$ and the second vertex is $v_{j,j+1}$ $(2 \leq j \leq k)$. Then $r(v_{j+1}|W) = r(v_{j+1,j+2}|W)$, for $2 \leq j < \frac{k+1}{2}$; $r(v_2|W) = r(v_{k,1}|W)$, for $j = \frac{k+1}{2}$; $r(v_1|W) = r(v_{2,3}|W)$, for $j = \frac{k+1}{2} + 1$ and $r(v_j|W) = r(v_{j-1,j}|W)$, for $\frac{k+1}{2} + 1 < j \leq k$, a contradiction.

(2) W contains one common vertex. Without loss of generality, we suppose that one vertex is $v_{1,2}$ and the second vertex is v_j $(1 \leq j \leq k)$. Then $r(v_{j+1}|W) = r(v_{j+1,j+2}|W)$, for $1 \leq j < \frac{k+1}{2}$; $r(v_1|W) = r(v_{k,1}|W)$, for $j = \frac{k+1}{2}$; $r(v_1|W) = r(v_2|W)$, for $j = \frac{k+1}{2} + 1$ and $r(v_2|W) = r(v_{2,3}|W)$, for $\frac{k+1}{2} + 1 < j \leq k$, a contradiction.

(3) W contains no common vertex. Without loss of generality, we suppose that one vertex is v_1 and the second vertex is v_j $(2 \leq j \leq k)$. Then $r(v_{j+1}|W) = r(v_{j+1,j+2}|W)$, for $2 \leq j < \frac{k+1}{2}$; $r(v_{j-1}|W) = r(v_{j+1,j+2}|W)$, for $j = \frac{k+1}{2}$; $r(v_{j+1}|W) = r(v_{j-2,j-1}|W)$, for $j = \frac{k+1}{2} + 1$ and $r(v_{j-1}|W) = r(v_{j-2,j-1}|W)$, for $\frac{k+1}{2} + 1 < j \leq k$, a contradiction.

Now, we will show that $dim(\mathcal{C}_{k,3}) \leq 3$. Take $W = \{v_1, v_2, v_{\frac{k+1}{2}}\}$. We note that, $r(v_{1,2}|W) = (1, 1, \frac{k-1}{2})$ and

$$r(v_j|W) = \begin{cases} (j, j-1, \frac{k+1}{2} - j + 1) & \text{for } 2 < j < \frac{k+1}{2}, \\ (\frac{k+1}{2}, \frac{k+1}{2}, 2) & \text{for } j = \frac{k+1}{2} + 1, \\ (k - j + 2, k - j + 3, j - \frac{k-1}{2}) & \text{for } \frac{k+1}{2} + 1 < j \leq k, \end{cases}$$

$$r(v_{j,j+1}|W) = \begin{cases} (j, j-1, \frac{k+1}{2} - i) & \text{for } 2 \leq j < \frac{k+1}{2}, \\ (\frac{k+1}{2}, \frac{k-1}{2}, 1) & \text{for } j = \frac{k+1}{2}, \\ (k-j+1, k-j+2, j-\frac{k-1}{2}) & \text{for } \frac{k+1}{2} < j \leq k. \end{cases}$$

One can see that all the vertices of $V(\mathcal{C}_{k,3}) \setminus W$ have distinct representations. This implies that $dim(\mathcal{C}_{k,3}) = 3$ when $k > 3$ is odd. □

Form the definition of the primal graph of a hypergraph H, we note that a path P is a shortest path between the vertices x and y in H if and only if P is a shortest path between x and y in the primal graph of H. Thus, we have the following straightforward result:

Theorem 2.13. *Let H be a hypergraph and $prim(H)$ be the primal graph of H. Then $dim(H) = dim(prim(H)) = dim(M(H))$.*

The primal graph of the dual H^* of a hypergraph H is not a simple graph, in this case, the middle graph of H^* is a simple graph. We discuss the metric dimension of dual hypergraphs separately in the following result, which also help us to characterize all the hypergraphs with metric dimension one.

Theorem 2.14. *Let H^* be the dual of a hypergraph H and $M(H^*)$ be the middle graph of H^*. Then $dim(H^*) = dim(M(H^*))$.*

Proof. By the definition of middle graph, for any two vertices u and v of H^*, a path P is a shortest path between the vertices u and v in H^* if and only if P is a shortest path between u and v in $M(H^*)$. Thus a set $W \subseteq V(H^*)$ is a minimum resolving set for H^* if and only if W is a minimum resolving set for $M(H^*)$. □

The middle graph of H^* is (1) a simple path P_m if and only if H is a hyperpath; (2) a simple cycle C_m if and only if H is a hypercycle. In [4], all the simple graphs with metric dimension 1 were characterized. It was shown that the metric dimension of a simple graph G is one if and only if G is a simple path P_m ($m \geq 1$). Now, we characterize all the hypergraphs with the metric dimension 1. In fact, all these hypergraphs are the dual hypergraphs and have been characterized in the following consequence of Theorem 2.14.

Corollary 2.15. *Let H be a hypergraph and H^* be the dual of H. Then $dim(H^*) = 1$ if and only if H is a hyperpath.*

In [7], it was shown that the metric dimension of a simple cycle C_m ($m \geq 3$) is two. Thus, we have the following corollary:

Corollary 2.16. *Let H be a hypercycle and H^* be the dual of H. Then $dim(H^*) = 2$.*

3. Partition Dimension of Hypergraphs

In this section, we study the partition dimension of hypergraphs. From Proposition 2.1, we have the following lemma:

Lemma 3.1. *Let Π be a resolving partition of $V(H)$. If $u, v \in C(i_1, i_2, ..., i_d)$ then u and v belong to distinct classes of Π.*

The following result gives the lower bound for the partition dimension of hypergraphs.

Proposition 3.2. *Let H be a hypergraph with k hyperedges. Then $pd(H) \geq \lambda + 1$, where $\lambda = \max |C(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_d)|$ in H.*

Proof. Since $\lambda = \max |C(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_d)|$ in H, by Lemma 3.1, we have at least λ disjoint classes $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_\lambda$ of $V(H)$. Since H is Sperner so there exists an edge E of H such that $C(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_d) \subset E$. Now, if $\Pi = \{S_1 \ldots, S_\lambda\}$ is a minimum resolving partition of $V(H)$ then there exist two vertices u and v in E such that $u, v \in S_i$ (say) with $r(u|\Pi) = (1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1) = r(v|\Pi)$, where 0 is at the ith place, a contradiction. Thus, $pd(H) \geq \lambda + 1$. □

The lower bound given in Proposition 3.2 is sharp for an n-uniform linear hyperpath.

In [3], it was shown that the partition dimension of a 2-uniform linear hypercycle (simple cycle) is three. The following result shows that the partition dimension of an n-uniform linear hypercycle is $n + 1$ except when the number of edges is even in 3-uniform linear hypercycle.

Theorem 3.3. *For $n \geq 2$, let $\mathcal{C}_{k,n}$ be an n-uniform linear hypercycle with $k \geq 3$ hyperedges. Then, for all n $(\neq 3)$, we have $pd(\mathcal{C}_{k,n}) = n + 1$ and*

$$pd\,(\mathcal{C}_{k,3}) = \begin{cases} 3, & \text{if } k \text{ is even,} \\ 4, & \text{if } k \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. For $n = 2$, a hypercycle $\mathcal{C}_{k,2}$ is a simple cycle on m vertices and it was shown that the partition dimension of a simple cycle is 3 [3], so $pd(\mathcal{C}_{k,2}) = 3$.

For all $n \geq 3$, we denote the vertices of $\mathcal{C}_{k,n}$ by v_i^j, where j $(1 \leq j \leq k)$ represents the hyperedge number of $\mathcal{C}_{k,n}$ and i $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ represents the vertex number of the jth hyperedge. Each $v_i^j \in E_j$, $2 \leq i \leq n-1$, represents a vertex of degree one and $v_n^j = v_1^{j+1} \in E_j \cap E_{j+1}$ represents a vertex of degree 2 with $v_n^k = v_1^1$.

For $n = 3$ and k is even. Since $pd(H) \leq dim(H) + 1$ so, by Theorem 2.12, we have $pd(\mathcal{C}_{k,3}) \leq 3$. Further, if we put all the vertices of $\mathcal{C}_{k,3}$ into two classes S_1 and S_2, then they do not form a resolving partition Π of $V(\mathcal{C}_{k,3})$ because it is easy to see that there exist two vertices u, v in a hyperedge such that $u, v \in S_1$ (say) and $r(u|\Pi) = (0, 1) = r(v|\Pi)$. Thus $pd(\mathcal{C}_{k,3}) = 3$.

For $n = 3$, k is odd, by Theorem 2.12 and by using the result $pd(H) \leq dim(H)+1$, we have $pd(\mathcal{C}_{k,3}) \leq 4$. For all $n \geq 4$, let $\Pi = \{S_1, S_2, ..., S_{n+1}\}$ be an $(n+1)$-ordered partition of $V(\mathcal{C}_{k,n})$. Where, for $k = 4$, $S_t = \{v_{t+1}^j \ : \ 1 \leq j \leq 4\}$ for all $1 \leq t \leq n-3$, $S_{n-2} = \{v_{n-1}^j \ : \ 1 \leq j \leq 3\}$, $S_{n-1} = \{v_1^j \ : \ 2 \leq j \leq 4\}$, $S_n = \{v_{n-1}^4\}$, $S_{n+1} = \{v_1^1\}$; and for all $k \geq 3$ and $k \neq 4$, $S_t = \{v_t^1, v_{t+1}^j \ : \ 2 \leq j \leq k\}$ for all $1 \leq t \leq n-3$, $S_t = \{v_t^1, v_{t+1}^j \ : \ 2 \leq j \leq k-2\}$ for $t = n-2, n-1$, $S_n = \{v_1^2\}$ and $S_{n+1} = \{v_{n-1}^k\}$. Now, it is a routine exercise to check that Π is a resolving partition of $V(\mathcal{C}_{k,n})$, which implies that $dim(\mathcal{C}_{k,n}) \leq n+1$.

Conversely, consider a hyperedge E_i of $\mathcal{C}_{k,n}$. Note that $C(i) = \{v_2^i, \ldots, v_{n-1}^i\}$, by Lemma 3.1, there are $n-2$ classes $S_1, \ldots, S_{n-2}$ which contains the vertices $v_2^i, \ldots, v_{n-1}^i$, respectively. Since $\lambda = max|C(i_1, \ldots, i_d)| = n-2$, by Proposition 3.2, there is at least one more class S_{n-1} which contains either v_1^i or v_n^i of E_i. Suppose that $v_1^i \in S_{n-1}$. Now, if the nth vertex v_n^i of E_i belongs to any of the classes $S_1, \ldots, S_{n-1}$, say $v_n^i \in S_j$, and if all these classes form a partition Π of $V(\mathcal{C}_{k,n})$, then $r(v_n^i|\Pi) = (1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1) = r(v_{j+1}^i|\Pi)$, where 0 is at the jth place, from where we conclude that Π is not a resolving partition. Thus we need at least one more class S_n for v_n^i. From this, we deduce that, to resolve all the vertices of a hyperedge $E \in E(\mathcal{C}_{k,n})$, a resolving partition Π of $V(\mathcal{C}_{k,n})$ needs to contain $|E| = n$ classes. But then, there exist two vertices $u \in E_i$ and $v \in E_j$ $(i \neq j)$ such that $u, v \in S_l$ (say) with $r(u|\Pi) = (1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1) = r(v|\Pi)$, where 0 is at the lth place, a contradiction. Hence $pd(\mathcal{C}_{k,n}) \geq n+1$. □

In [2], it was shown that a 2-uniform linear hyperpath (simple path) has partition dimension 2. Now, we generalize this result by proving that if H is an n-uniform linear hyperpath $(n \geq 2)$, then the partition dimension of H is n.

Theorem 3.4. *For $n \geq 2$, let H be an n-uniform linear hypergraph with k hyperedges. Then, for a 3-uniform linear hyperpath H with even hyperedges, $pd(H) = 3$ and for all other values of n, $pd(H) = n$ if and only if H is a hyperpath.*

Proof. Let H be an n-uniform linear hyperpath. Then it is a routine exercise to verify that a partition $\Pi = \{S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_n\}$ of $V(H)$, where each S_i, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, contains the ith vertex of every hyperedge of H and S_n contains the nth vertex of the kth hyperedge, is a minimum resolving partition.

Conversely, suppose that $\Pi = \{S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_n\}$ be a minimum resolving partition of $V(H)$ and H is an n-uniform linear hypergraph. For $n = 2$, H is a 2-uniform linear hyperpath since the partition dimension of a graph is 2 if and only if the graph is a simple path (2-uniform linear hyperpath) [2]. For $n = 3$, k, odd and for all $n \geq 4$, if H is not a hyperpath then either H contains a hypercycle or H is a hypertree. Suppose that H contains a hypercycle, then by using the similar arguments as given in the proof of Theorem 3.3, we can see that $pd(H) \geq n+1$, a contradiction. Now, suppose that H is a hypertree. Consider a path P :

$v, E_1, w_1, E_2, w_2, ..., E_{l-1}, w_{l-1}, E_l, u$ between two diametral vertices v and u in H. Then P contains either a pendant hyperedge, say E_p, or a branch with joint E_{p_1} (say), or both a pendant hyperedge and a branch. In the first case, if $|E_p \cap (E_i \cap E_j)| = 1$ $(i \neq j)$, then there exist two vertices x, y in H, either $x \in E_p$ and $y \in E_i$ or E_j, or $x \in E_i$ and $y \in E_j$, such that $x, y \in S_t$ (say) and have $r(x|\Pi) = (1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1) = r(y|\Pi)$, where 0 is at the tth place. If $|E_p \cap E_i| = 1$ for all $i \neq 1, l$, then there are two vertices $x \in E_p$ and $y \in E_i$ such that $x, y \in S_j$ (say) and have $r(x|\Pi) = (1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1) = r(y|\Pi)$, where 0 is at the jth place, a contradiction to the fact that Π is resolving partition. Similarly, in the second and third case, we can see that a partition of cardinality n is not a resolving partition of $V(H)$. Thus H is an n-uniform linear hyperpath. □

Recall that the rank of a hypergraph H is the maximum number of vertices in a hyperedge. One might think that the partition dimension of H is always greater than or equal to the rank of H. This is true for an n-uniform linear hyperpath and an n-uniform linear hypercycle $\mathcal{C}_{k,3}$ with even k. But, it is not true, in general, as we show in the following example:

Example 3.5. *Let H be a hypergraph with vertex set $V(H) = \{v_i : 1 \leq i \leq 11\}$ and edge set $E(H) = \{E_1 = \{v_i;\ 1 \leq i \leq 7\}, E_2 = \{v_i;\ 6 \leq i \leq 11\}\}$. Clearly, $rank(H) = 7$, $\lambda = 5$ and $\Pi = \{S_i = \{v_i, v_{i+5}\};\ 1 \leq i \leq 5, S_6 = \{v_{11}\}\}$ is a minimum resolving partition of V(H). This implies that $pd(H) = 6 \neq rank(H)$.*

Likewise the results on the metric dimension of the primal and the dual graph of a hypergraph, we have the following two results on the partition dimension of the primal and the dual graph of a hypergraph, respectively:

Theorem 3.6. *Let H be a hypergraph and $prim(H)$ be the primal graph of H. Then $pd(H) = pd(prim(H))$.*

Theorem 3.7. *Let H^* be the dual of a hypergraph H and $M(H^*)$ be the middle graph of H^*. Then $pd(H^*) = pd(M(H^*))$.*

Since, it was shown that the simple paths P_m are the only graphs with $pd(P_m) = 2$ [2] and the partition dimension of the simple cycles C_m is 3, so, by Theorem 3.7, we have the following corollaries:

Corollary 3.8. *Let H be a hypergraph and H^* be the dual of H. Then $pd(H^*) = 2$ if and only if H is a hyperpath.*

Corollary 3.9. *Let H be a hypercycle and H^* be the dual of H. Then $dim(H^*) = 3$.*

References

[1] Caceres, J., Hernando, C., Mora, M., Pelayoe, I M., Puertas, M L., Seara, C., Wood, D R. On the metric dimension of cartesian product of graphs, SIAM J. of Disc. Math., 2007, 21(2): 423-441.

[2] Chartrand, G., Salehi, E., Zhang, P. The partition dimension of a graph, Aequationes Math., 2000, 59: 45-54.
[3] Chartrand, G., Salehi, E., Zhang, P. On the partition dimension of a graph, Congr. Numer., 1998, 130: 157-168.
[4] Chartrand, G., Eroh, L., Johnson, M A., Oellermann, O R. Resolvability in graphs and the metric dimension of a graph. Disc. Appl. Math., 2000, 105: 99-113.
[5] Chaudhry, M A., Javaid, I., Salman, M. Fault-Tolerant metric and partition dimension of graphs. Util. Math., 2010, 83: 187-199.
[6] Garey, M R., Johnson, D S. Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness (Freeman, W H., San Francisco), 1979.
[7] Harary, F., Melter, R A. On the metric dimension of a graph. Ars Combin., 1976, 2: 191-195.
[8] Hernando, C., Mora, M., Pelayoe, I M., Seara, C., Wood, D R. Extremal Graph Theory for Metric Dimension and Diameter. Elect. Notes in Disc. Math., 2007, 29: 339-343.
[9] Javaid, I., Salman, M., Chaudhry, M A., Shokat, S. Fault-Tolerance in Resolvability. Util. Math., 2009, 80: 263-275.
[10] Javaid, I., Rahim, M T., Ali, K. Families of regular graphs with constant metric dimension. Util. Math., 2008, 75: 21-33.
[11] Khuller, S., Raghavachari, B. Rosenfeld, A.: Landmarks in graphs. Disc. Appl. Math., 1996, 70: 217-229.
[12] Salman, M., Javaid, I., Chaudhry, M A. Resolvability in circulant graphs. Acta. Math. Sinica, Englich Series., 2012, 28(9): 1851-1864.
[13] Slater, P J. Leaves of trees. Congr. Numer., 1975, 14: 549-559.

1. Center for advanced studies in Pure and Applied Mathematics, Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan, Pakistan.
E-mail: ijavaidbzu@gmail.com, solo33@gmail.com, mishi_abi@hotmail.com

2. Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Jazan University, Jazan, Saudi Arabia. Email: aahaider@jazanu.edu.sa